

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 638

UD 017 141

AUTHOR Siegelman, Marvin
TITLE Harlem Parents School-Community Neighborhood Center;
Community District Umbrella Programs 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 13p.; New York City Board of Education Function No.
20-63406
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Tutoring; *Diagnostic Teaching;
Elementary Education; Parent Conferences; *Program
Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial
Reading
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This report evaluated the Harlem Parents School Community Program designed to provide individual tutorial assistance to 80 elementary school students who were two or more years below grade level in reading and mathematics. Tutoring sessions were held at a neighborhood center Monday through Thursday afternoons and evenings. Workshops and cultural enrichment sessions were held on Friday afternoons. The program also provided referral services for parent and student problems. Parents were counseled and informed of their child's needs, progress, and school activities. Parents and students completed questionnaires concerning the various functions of the center. Tutors submitted weekly student progress reports and met with parents once a month. This report concluded that post test scores indicated no significant improvement in reading comprehension. An assessment of mathematics improvement could not be made because test scores were not on students' records. (JP)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED142638

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63406

HARLEM PARENTS SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
COMMUNITY DISTRICT UMBRELLA PROGRAMS 1975-1976

Prepared by:

Marvin Siegelman, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs
funded under a Special Grant of the New York State
Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the
City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

600 17141

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM	1
CHAPTER II: EVALUATION PROCEDURES	3
CHAPTER III: FINDINGS	4
CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8
TABLES (APPENDIX)	10

CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM

The Harlem Parents School Community Neighborhood Center program was designed to provide remedial instruction in reading and math to students who needed assistance in acquiring basic reading and math skills as they were typically two years below grade level. The program was designed to give individual tutoring to 80 pupils from 22 poverty area public schools. The tutoring took place at the neighborhood center Monday through Thursday, 3:30 to 8:10 P.M. Friday afternoon was devoted to workshops and cultural enrichment. The parents of pupils in the program were counseled and informed about their child's needs, progress, and school activities. The program provided referral services with follow up for pupils and parents, where problems existed that interfered with school learning. Pupils were selected on the basis of consultation between the center's staff, the staff of the pupil's school, and the parents of the pupil.

The staff consisted of one project coordinator, one head teacher, three regular teachers, one assistant teacher, three teacher aids, and twelve educational assistants (tutors). Due to late hiring, the program did not start until the end of December. Some tutors left the program in October and November because they could not be given definite assurance that they would be hired.

All pupils were given the Houghton Mifflin Informal Reading Inventory when they entered the program. This brief diagnostic test includes an Instant (word)-Recognition Test and a Silent-Reading Comprehension Test to estimate the instructional level

for a given child. General observations of reading habits and oral reading problems are also noted. In addition, a short teacher-made math test is given to all entering pupils that covers addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and fractions. Each tutor selected his own curriculum materials for each child on the basis of his evaluation of the pupil's needs, in consultation with the head teacher. The diagnosis of basic skill weaknesses and strengths was based on previous testing in the schools and at the center, and on reports from the pupil's teacher concerning his work and progress at school. The program focused on determining the specific reading and math level of a given child and then systematically attempting to progress to higher levels. A wide variety of curriculum materials were available and each tutor developed an individualized program for each pupil. The children and their parents filled out questionnaires concerning the various functions of the center. These questionnaires were used by the staff to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the center. Each week the tutors filled out a report on his work with each pupil. Once a month the tutors met with the parents to discuss the plans and progress of the program. Systematic and periodic monitoring of tutors and teachers was conducted by the head teacher and project coordinator.

As a result of being in the program the pupils were expected to achieve statistically significant growth in their reading and mathematics scores as measured by the New York City Tests. Changes in reading ability was measured by scores on the New York City Test administered in April, 1975 and in April, 1976.

The program was operative for the entire school year 1975-1976.

CHAPTER II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The evaluation objectives were:

1. To determine whether as a result of attending 65% or more of the Harlem Parents School-Community Neighborhood Center program sessions, the reading grades of the participating pupils would show statistically significant differences between the real post-test scores and the anticipated post-test scores.
2. To determine whether as a result of attending 65% or more of the Harlem Parents School-Community Neighborhood Center program sessions, the mathematics grades of the participating pupils would show statistically significant differences between the real post-test scores and the anticipated post-test scores.
3. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually implemented, coincided with the program as described in the proposal.

A Historical Regression Analysis was used to determine if the reading grades on the New York Citywide Test (NYC Test) showed a statistically significant difference between the real (or obtained) post-test score (April, 1976 NYC testing) and the anticipated post-test score (based on the April, 1975 NYC pre-test scores). Reading scores available for 21 pupils in the program based on a variety of reading tests other than the NYC Tests could not be included in the data analysis. Where pre-test and post-test reading scores other than the NYC Tests were available,

the sample size per grade was only one or two. There were 11 pupils in the program who did not take the NYC pre-test or the NYC post-test. Pre-test and post NYC Test data were available for 38 pupils on the Vocabulary subtest and for 41 pupils on the Comprehension subtest who attended 65% or more of the program sessions. Eleven pupils with NYC pre-test and post-test scores were eliminated because they attended less than 65% of the program sessions. Reading test data were incomplete (no NYC pre-test and/or post-test scores) or non-usable (non NYC Test results, or less than 65% attendance in the program) for 43 participating pupils. NYC Test data were analyzed for 41 of the 84 participating pupils.

There were only two complete pre-test and post-test mathematics scores present in the pupil records made available to the present evaluator by the project director. It appears that a limited number of pupils took the April, 1976 NYC Tests in mathematics, and so very few were sent in to the project director. The evaluation of mathematics achievement, as noted in the second objective, therefore, could not be done.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

A Historical Regression Analysis was used to determine whether as a result of attending 65% or more of the Harlem Parents School-Community Neighborhood Center program sessions, the reading grades of the participating pupils would show a statistically significant difference between the real post-test scores and the anticipated post-test scores when a correlated t test was applied. Grades were combined because of low sample size in each grade. There was one pupil in grade two, two pupils

in grade three, thirteen pupils in grade four, four pupils in grade five, ten pupils in grade six, six students in grade seven, and five students in grade eight. The correlated t test results for vocabulary are shown in Table 1 on page 11 in the Appendix. The mean anticipated post-test score for second, third and fourth-grade pupils ($N=15$) was 4.581, and the standard deviation was 2.245. The mean post-test score for second, third and fourth grade pupils was 5.347, and the standard deviation was 2.473. The difference for vocabulary achievement between the anticipated post-test and actual post-test scores was not significant (correlated $t = 1.751$). For the fifth and sixth grade pupils ($N=12$) the mean anticipated post-test score was 4.321, and the standard deviation was 1.755. The mean post-test score for the fifth and sixth grade pupils was 5.400 and the standard deviation was 1.573. There was a significant difference (correlated $t = 4.237$) between the anticipated and actual post-test vocabulary scores for the fifth and sixth graders beyond the .01 level of confidence. The mean anticipated post-test score for the seventh and eighth grade students ($N=11$) was 6.858, and the standard deviation was 2.328. The post-test mean score for the seventh and eighth grade students was 6.645, and the standard deviation was 2.857. The correlated t test of -0.400 indicated that there was no significant difference between the anticipated and actual post-test vocabulary scores for the seventh and eighth grade students.

The correlated t test results for comprehension are shown in Table 2 on page 11 in the Appendix. The mean anticipated

post-test score for second, third and fourth grade pupils ($N=16$) was 3.955 and the standard deviation was 1.366. The mean post-test score for this group was 4.263 and the standard deviation was 1.670. The difference on comprehension achievement between the anticipated and actual post-test scores was not significant [correlated $t = 1.450$]. For the fifth and sixth grade pupils ($N=14$) the mean anticipated post-test score was 5.437 and the standard deviation was 2.169. For this group the mean post-test score was 6.086 and the standard deviation was 2.135. There was no significant difference [correlated $t = 1.377$] between the anticipated and the actual post-test vocabulary scores for the fifth and sixth grade pupils. The mean anticipated post-test score for seventh and eighth grade students ($N=11$) was 6.604 and the standard deviation was 2.402. For the seventh and eighth grade students the mean post-test score was 6.618 and the standard deviation was 2.129. There was no significant difference [correlated $t = 0.036$] between the anticipated and the actual post-test comprehension scores for the seventh and eighth grade students.

Except for the fifth and sixth grade results for vocabulary, the above findings indicate that objective number one was not achieved. These findings, however, may be misleading. The comparison of the NYC pre-test scores that were obtained in April, 1975 with the April, 1976 post-test data require the use of an 11 month period. In the Historical Regression Analysis the estimate of the anticipated post-test score (believed to occur if the pupils had not been in the program being evaluated) is based on the period elapsing between the pre-test and the post-test,

or 11 months, and this period is supposed to reflect the number of months the pupils were in the program. The growth in reading scores of the anticipated post-test scores reflects growth believed to occur over an 11 month period if the pupils had not been in the program. In actual fact, however, the 41 pupils evaluated were only in the program between 3 and 5 months, as the program did not start until December, 1975 and the actual post-test data were collected in April, 1976. The use of 11 months required by the actual dates of pre-test and post-test data collection produced an inflated or high estimate of the anticipated post-test results. You expect much more improvement over an 11 month period than over a 3 to 5 month period. A maximum of five months, therefore, should be used, and not eleven months, to estimate the growth in achievement if the pupils had not been in the program. The use of an 11 month period erroneously reduces the magnitude of anticipated post-test versus actual post-test mean differences (by inflating anticipated post-test scores) and so reduces the possibility of significant findings.

A more suitable analysis would be to test each pupil when he starts the program and again at the end of the program, and then apply the Historical Regression Analysis. This procedure would not only be more sound statistically, it would greatly facilitate the accumulation of reading and mathematics test data in contrast to relying on the schools to send in scores obtained only in April.

The atmosphere in the observed classes was quite conducive to learning. In general there was one tutor for one pupil, and at times one tutor for two or three pupils. Each pupil received

a great deal of individual instruction. The rooms and halls were quiet, the pupils were relaxed, well behaved, and appeared motivated to learn. The teachers were hard working, competent, patient, well organized, and enthusiastic about their work. The physical facilities were adequate and enhanced individualized instruction.

The project coordinator, head teacher, and tutors indicated that they had enough materials and supplies for this program. The supply room was well stocked with a large variety of readers, workbooks, and educational games.

The program appears to clearly service the needs of the target population, pupils who were retarded in reading and/or mathematics by two or more years below grade level. The program as implemented did coincide with the program as described in the project proposal.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The statistical analysis of the mean NYC post-test versus the anticipated post-test scores indicated no significant improvement in comprehension and significant improvement in vocabulary only for the fifth and sixth grade pupils. Serious questions were raised, however, concerning the use of 11 months (April, 1975 to April, 1976) as a basis for predicting post-test improvement when in fact the students spent between three and five months in the program when they were tested in April, 1976. An evaluation of mathematics improvement could not be done as pre-test and post-test scores were not available in the pupil records.

The program was in full operation during the school year

and effectively coordinated by the program director. Physical facilities and materials used in the program were adequate and as described in the proposal.

Conclusions

Because the program was implemented according to the description in the project proposal, and since there are serious questions concerning the use of the Historical Regression Analysis for the present sample, the program can be considered successful, and it is recommended that the program be continued.

Recommendations

1. Have teachers in the program test each child when he starts the program in mathematics and reading and at the end of the program with a standardized test such as the MAT. In order to evaluate improvement of reading and mathematics, an indication of achievement level must be obtained when the pupils start the program.
2. Include parent reactions and participation in the program as a specific program objective to be evaluated in a systematic and objective manner.
3. Insure early hiring of tutors so that tutorial functions can start in September or October.
4. Use MAT pre-test results as a diagnostic tool to plan specific remedial work for each pupil, especially in building mathematics skills.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Comparison of Anticipated Post-test versus Actual Post-test
Mean NYC Grade Equivalency Vocabulary Scores by Grade Level

Grades	N	Pre-test		Anticipated Post-test		Actual Post-test		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
2-4	15	3.747	1.790	4.581	2.245	5.347	2.473	1.751	n.s.
5-6	12	3.458	1.580	4.321	1.755	5.400	1.573	4.237	.01
7-8	11	6.118	2.032	6.858	2.328	6.645	2.857	0.400	n.s.

Table 2

Comparison of Anticipated Post-test versus Actual Post-test
Mean NYC Grade Equivalency Comprehension Scores by Grade Level

Grades	N	Pre-test		Anticipated Post-test		Actual Post-test		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
2-4	16	3.281	1.080	3.955	1.366	4.263	1.670	1.450	n.s.
5-6	14	4.714	1.835	5.437	2.168	6.086	2.135	1.377	n.s.
7-8	11	5.818	2.095	6.604	2.402	6.618	2.129	0.036	n.s.